

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CHRIS HAROLD CAVE,
 Plaintiff,

vs.

JPM CHASE BANK INVESTMENTS
 DIVISION, *et al.*,
 Defendants.

Case No. 2:16-cv-01806-RFB-GWF

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Petition to Enter R-903; 901(4-6) and 902, Self-Authenticating Repudiating Evidence Just in Case, onto this Court's Docket and Records (ECF No. 25), filed on October 18, 2016. Defendant filed its Response (ECF No. 31) on November 4, 2016.

Although Courts broadly construe pleadings filed by pro se litigants, even pro se litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't.*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir.1990); *see also Carter v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue*, 784 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1986). Pro se litigants are not treated more favorably than parties with attorneys of record and are expected to abide by the rules of the court in which litigation proceeds. *Carter*, 784 F.2d at 1008. Pleadings by pro se litigants, regardless of deficiencies, should only be judged by function, not form. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 521 (1972).

Even broadly construed, Plaintiff's motion fails procedurally and is not coherent. To the extent that Plaintiff intends to give notice to the opposing parties that he may use the documents attached to his motion as evidence, then he need only serve on Defendants a disclosure of such evidence pursuant to Rule 26(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. He should not file such documents with the Court. To the extent that Plaintiff is requesting that the Court hold that these documents are admissible in evidence at trial, Plaintiff should file an appropriate motion in limine so stating. Accordingly,

DATED this 7th day of November, 2016.

2